



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

2 to 4 p.m.—Organization, Election of Officers, and other business.

4 to 5.—“The Status of Modern Language Study in Ontario.” G. E. SHAW, B.A.

7.30 to 8.30.—“The Uses of Modern Language Study.” F. H. SYKES, B.A.

8.30 to 9.30.—“French in University College.” J. SQUAIR, B.A.

9.30 to 10.30.—“Methods of Teaching Moderns to Beginners.” A. W. WRIGHT, B.A.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 30TH.

10 to 10.30.—Address by DANIEL WILSON, LL.D.

10.30 to 11.30.—“Examinations in Modern Languages.” R. BALMER, B.A.

11.30 to 12.30.—“English Literature and Grammar.” E. J. MCINTYRE, B.A.

---

*Ruthenisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, verfasst von EUGEN ŻELECHOWSKI, k. k. Gymnasial Professor in Stanislaw. Lemberg, 1886.

The dictionary of the Malo-Russian or Ruthenish language, as it is sometimes called, now in course of publication by Professor Żelechowski, of Stanislaw (Galicia), will be welcomed by many students. Up to this time we have been obliged to content ourselves with imperfect dictionaries or scanty vocabularies. *The Deutsch-Ruthenisches Handwörterbuch* of Professor Partitzki (Lemberg, 1867) was unfortunately not followed by a Ruthenish-German part. The vocabulary of Piskounov (Odessa, 1873) is but meagre, and the student who wished to make himself familiar with the works of Shevchenko, for example, had to pick his way carefully through thorny paths without any adequate guide.

The Malo, or Little Russian language, as it ought properly to be called, the term Ruthenish being without meaning—is spoken by upwards of sixteen millions of people, scattered over Southern Russia, Galicia, Bukovina and part of Northeastern Hungary. The expression Little Russia (Russian: *Malaya Rossia*) is found as early as 1292 in a Byzantine writer. The

terms Ruthen, Russniak, are only corruptions of the word Russian. They appear, however, early.

There has always been considerable dispute as to whether it should be considered a dialect or a language—a matter in no case easy to decide. It is sometimes a political question, and the discussion has probably been influenced by political views in the present case. Certainly, if Kiev had remained the capital of Russia, Malo-Russian would have become the predominant dialect. We shall probably do right in following Miklosich, Schleicher and Jagić, and shall consider it to be a language. The first of the three in his great ‘Comparative Grammar of the Slavonic Languages,’ treats of it under a separate heading. As might be imagined in the case of a tongue which has been so little studied, and can shew but a scanty literature, the orthography varies considerably. Thus it is different in Osadtza, author of a grammar, Zelechowski and Barvinski, compiler of a reading-book (*Chitanka*). Osadtza employs *ž* and *š*; these, however, are rejected by Żelechowski, who also uses a special letter for the ordinary hard sound of *g*, and employs the Cyrillic *g* for the sound of *h*, so common in Malo-Russian. A very fantastic spelling was adopted by Gattzouk in his *Ouzhinok Ridnogo Pola*, ‘Gleanings from a Native Field’ (Moscow, 1857), but it does not seem to have been employed by any other writer.

The Malo-Russian language is now in a fair way of being properly studied: there is the excellent grammar of Michael Osadtza, a pupil of Miklosich, 1864, in which the language is treated quite scientifically just as Šuman, another pupil has done with Slovenish (Slovenska Slovnica, Laibach, 1882), and now we have a copious dictionary which is appearing in parts, and has already reached the letter *u*. It has formed the subject of a favorable article in the Philological Review (*Prace Filologiczne*) of Warsaw, from the pen of Dr. J. Hanusz. The dictionary is very copious, and I have frequently tested its utility. It will be a great advantage when we get the remaining letters of the alphabet.

The useful Chrestomathy of A. Barvinski appeared at Lemberg in 1870, in three parts. The first is devoted to the popular literature,

and the folk-songs of which the Malo-Russians have a goodly store; and the other two are filled with selections from the printed literature, beginning with Kotliarevski (1769-1838) who made himself celebrated by his burlesque of a portion of the 'Eneid.' Some of the Little Russians, however, do not regard this production with pleasure, but consider that it is calculated to bring the language into contempt. Extracts are given from about forty authors, by far the most celebrated being Taras Shevchenko, of whom I published a short notice with a few extracts in Macmillan's Magazine, (April, 1886). The Novelists Kvitka and Madame Markovich, who writes under the *nom de guerre* of Marko Vovchok, have earned considerable reputation in Russia, and P. Koulish has produced some valuable works. A fine collection of the *Doum*, or popular legendary poems corresponding to the Russian *bi-lini* was commenced by Messrs. Dragomanov and Antonovich, but it never got farther than the second volume, of which, indeed, only a portion appeared. Dragomanov also published a good collection of folk-tales (*Malorousskia Narodnia Predania i Razskazi*, Kiev, 1876). He now edits a Malo-Russian Journal, 'The Commune' (Hromada), at Geneva, of ultra-liberal tendencies.

The phonology of Little Russian is curious: the Great Russian *ye* (expressed by the letter *yat*) and *o* frequently become *i*, as *richka*=*riechka*, a river, *kin*=*kon*, a horse, and the thick *l* (the barred *l* of Polish) becomes *v* or *ou*, especially at the end of a word or before other consonants, e. g. *pisaon*=*pisal*, he wrote; *dougo*=*dolgo*, long. The language resembles Polish in having no present participle passive, and it has incorporated many Polish words (e. g. *Shukati*=Pol. *Szukać*), as might be expected when we remember how long the people were under Polish rule. These, however, must be carefully sifted, but the time has hardly yet come for an etymological dictionary of the language. There is also an occasional use of a diminutive infinitive in *tiki*=*tochki* as *spatochki*, to sleep a little.

There are several dialects, among which may be specified that of the Ukraine, the dialect of the Gouzoules and Boiki in Bukovina, the Red Russian of Galicia and the Ugro-Rus-

sian spoken to the North of the Carpathians. In the Red Russian dialect the suffix of the infinitive is *ti*—as in the Church Slavonic; this in the dialect of the Ukraine has been softened into *ti*, especially before the reflexive *sa*. The dialect of the Gouzoules may be seen in the poems of Fedkovich. The peculiarities of Ugro-Russian have been discussed by the late Prof. Sreznevski, of the University of St. Petersburg, and many of them are given in the *Ugro-Rousskia Narodnia Piesni*, published by Devollant in the Transactions of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society (St. Petersburg, 1885).

W. R. MORFILL.

Oxford, England.

---

WILHELM BODE: *Die Kenningar in der angelsächsischen Dichtung*. Mit Ausblicken auf andere Litteraturen. Darmstadt und Leipzig, 1886. [Strasburg Dissertation].

The dissertation-writers are rushing into a new field, and have already surveyed a goodly quantity of ground which the philologists of a past generation either feared or forgot to tread. The study of purely poetical style, it is true, has been from time immemorial the favorite poaching-ground of makers and lovers of Rhetoric; writers on Aesthetics have devoted to the subject a large space in their *hortus siccus*; but till within a decade or so, little work had been done on the lines of the historical method. In 1875 appeared, as we all know, Heinzel's essay "Ueber den Stil der altgermanischen Poesie,"—a suggestive and almost brilliant study. It called out a number of dissertations, among which the most noteworthy—I postpone my formal exceptions and rebuttal to a part of it—was Hoffmann's paper (*Eng. Stud.* VI, 163 ff.): 'Der bildliche Ausdruck im Béowulf und in der Edda.' Still better, in my opinion, is the dissertation now before us. It is confined not only to a particular manifestation of poetical style, but to a particular literature,—a literature easily mastered and vexed by comparatively few distracting elements. Decidedly the weakest part of Bode's work is his attempt—though he is modest enough in his profession—to collect parallel examples from other literatures. Except in the case of O.-S., these are simply pro-